

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

L.R. No.: 4114-01
Bill No.: Truly Agreed To and Finally Passed HB 1179
Subject: Agriculture and Animals; business & commerce; Attorney General, State; Natural Resources Dept.
Type: Original
Date: May 22, 2012

Bill Summary: This proposal prohibits large water users from transporting water withdrawn or diverted from the Southeast Missouri Regional Water District to a location outside the district if it interferes with another major use.

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>Other</u> State Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 4 pages.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0

☐ Estimated Total Net Effect on All funds expected to exceed \$100,000 savings or (cost).

☐ Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue Fund expected to exceed \$100,000 (cost).

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS			
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015
Local Government	\$0	\$0	\$0

FISCAL ANALYSIS

ASSUMPTION

Officials at the **Department of Natural Resources (DNR)** assume this proposal would prohibit large water consumers from taking and transporting water from within the Southeast Missouri Regional Water District to locations outside the District, if such taking and transporting interferes with the normal water usage of certain other large water consumers. If such interference occurs, the Attorney General or the affected parties may seek an injunction. No injunction may be issued if it would harm public health or safety.

DNR assumes there is no fiscal impact from this proposed legislation.

Officials at the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assumes that any potential costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources.

Officials at the **Department of Agriculture** assumes there is no fiscal impact from this proposed legislation.

Officials from **Scott County, Mississippi County, Stoddard County, Butler County, New Madrid County, Pemiscot County, and Dunklin County** did not respond to the request for fiscal impact.

Oversight assumes there is no fiscal impact from this proposed legislation.

<u>FISCAL IMPACT - State Government</u>	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government</u>	FY 2013 (10 Mo.)	FY 2014	FY 2015
	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

FISCAL DESCRIPTION

The proposed legislation appears to have no fiscal impact.


This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Office of the Attorney General
Department of Agriculture
Department of Natural Resources

NOT RESPONDING

Scott County
Mississippi County
Stoddard County
Butler County
New Madrid County
Pemiscot County
Dunklin County



Mickey Wilson, CPA
Director
May 22, 2012